GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES MARCH 3, 2003

- 1. Attendance See Attendance Sheet attachment.
- 2. Review and Acceptance of February 3, 2003 meeting minutes.

ACTION: Mr. Roberto Sanchez made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Leonard Wien. The motion passed.

3. Change Orders

Mr. Marty Hyman wanted to know why there was an additional cost for phone conduit and receptacle concrete pad for FPL electric transformer. He also wanted to know if there had been an error and omission in the design of the documents.

Mr. Todd Osborn of URS explained that the relocation of the service causes the extra expense. He added that additional costs are not recoverable at this point. He said that the change order is forwarded to the contractor for the extra work he has to do. This would not hold up the work and construction can continue on the project. He said that if there is a problem with errors and omission, it would be settled at project completion.

4. Project Status Report

(A) Lummus Park

Mr. Tim Hemstreet provided a verbal update and reported to the Committee that the Historic Preservation Board had discussed the proposed restoration of the 14th Street restroom. Minor adjustments to the design concept were being considered pursuant to the HPB input.

Mr. William Cary, Assistant Planning Director of the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) added that final approval was needed at the next HPB meeting scheduled for April 8, 2003 and that construction would likely be able to begin in the Fall 2003.

(B) Indian Creek Greenway

Bruce Henderson of the Public Works Department reported that the City has to obtain easements on shoreline properties in order to move forward with the project. He added that development of Phase I is being prepared with enough funding from G.O. Bond funds and Stormwater funds. He continued by saying that the City owns most of the foot bridge located between 24th and 29th Street. He added that Mayor David Dermer has volunteered to meet with some of the

owners to potentially facilitate an agreement. He said that EDAW and Coastal Systems International are also involved on some level with the project.

Mr. Cary commented that there is no coordination on this project between the Public Works Department and the Planning Department and that an update should be done on a regular basis. He added that he had prepared the project and wanted more communication with regard to the status of the project.

Mayor David Dermer commented that it would be a good idea for updates to be given on a regular basis.

Mr. Henderson said that there was no attempt to exclude any parties from the project and they would be invited to all upcoming meetings.

(C) Alton Road Corridor Enhancements

Joseph Johnson of the Public Works Department reported that the Alton Road Corridor Enhancement project has been divided into two sections, Phase I from Michigan to 63rd Street and Phase II from 41st Street to Michigan. He added that the project would not begin until April 2004. He reported that resurfacing, remilling and renovation is set to begin on Phase II sometime in July 2004. He added that \$135,000 in G.O. Bond funds will be used for the Gateway treatments, which will be located on the medians. The gateway treatments could be as elaborate as desired depending on the funding. These gateway treatments would compliment traffic calming measures to slow down the speed of vehicles entering the area, enhance the medians, and possibly announce to drivers that they are entering a particular neighborhood.

Amy Rabin informed Mr. Johnson that the light signal on Dade Boulevard and Alton Road was very dangerous. Mr. Johnson explained that he was aware of the situation and that the county wants to get rid of the signal for the left turn lane. He said that this would make it safer on Alton Road and Dade Boulevard. He added that the plans are not 100% complete and that the timeframe would be sometime in May before this project could come before the Committee.

Mr. Roberto Sanchez informed Mr. Johnson that the signal at Allison and Saint Francis was not working correctly. Mr. Johnson responded by saying he would inform the county.

Mr. LeJeune wanted to know the status of the Venetian Causeway project. He added that something should be done with Miami-Dade County to get it going.

Mr. Hemstreet explained that this area was on the County's right-of-way. He added that the reason the project is being held up is that the County does not have funds in place for any improvements, nor have they hired a designer for the project.

Mr. Leonard Wien suggested that changes be made to the new format of the Project Status Report so that it includes a summary/total of funding to date, and a summary of projects in each phase of construction.

5. Informational Items

(A) The Updated Calendar of Scheduled Community Design Meetings was provided to the Committee.

(B) Update on Fire Station No. 2

Mr. Hemstreet informed the Committee that at the February 5, 2003 City Commission meeting, the Mayor and Commission rejected the City Manager's recommendation to terminate the Agreement with Jasco on the Fire Station No.2 The Administration was directed to amend the Agreement to include project. several provisos that include an increase in the retainage to twenty percent (20%) of the value of the contract instead of the customary ten percent (10%) and a monthly progress report by Jasco submitted to the G.O. Bond Committee through the CIP Office. The provisos include an updated Project schedule showing March 2003 as the start of construction, an expanded liquidated damages clause set at \$1,500 per day and the previously agreed requirements that Jasco provide the GMP for the Water Tanks independently of the Fire Station No. 2 GMP, that the current GMP does not in any way bind the City to accept a GMP for the Fire Station portion of the Project, and that the Agreements with the sub-contractors be assignable to the City in case the Agreement with Jasco is terminated in the future for any reason.

(C) Update on Fire Station No. 4

Mr. Hemstreet informed the Committee that on February 5, 2003, the Mayor and City Commission adopted a Resolution to approve and authorize an award of additional services in the amount of \$64,791 for the Fire Station No. 4 project. These additional services were approved with a caveat to revisit the possible demolition or the relocation of the historic structure and issue a final directive to the Administration on how to proceed. At the February 26, 2003 Commission meeting, the Commission referred the discussion of possible demolition to the Finance and Citywide Projects Committee. The Administration added that if the directive is to demolish the existing building, the Administration will present the project to the HP Board for consideration on April 8, 2003. He added that depending on the final Commission decision (projected for April 30, 2003), the overall schedule may be impacted by a delay of between 30 to 120 days. If the recommendation by the HPB is to not approve the demolition of the existing building and the City Commission accepts the recommendation, a three (3) to four (4) month delay should be anticipated in the Project's overall schedule. The Committee requested that a legal opinion be obtained regarding the appropriateness of using G.O. Bond funds for the relocation, shoring and stabilization of the historic facility.

Mr. Frank Del Vecchio went into a detailed discussion on what he believed should happen to the historic building. He said that it was clear that the old Fire Station was not useable and should be demolished, and that no G.O. Bond funds should be spent on it. He said that the funds should be spent on a new Fire Station. He added that the City Attorney should be asked for his opinion on what could be done with the GO Bond funds.

Mr. Mike Rotbart commented that he agreed with Mr. Del Vecchio and that the issue of safety should be resolved as soon as possible.

Mayor Dermer wanted to know if the demolishing of the old building would save time in the construction of the new building.

Mr. Hemstreet explained that it did not save time and that it was more of a cost issue than delaying progress.

Ms. Deede Weithorn wanted to know the cost to move the building vs. the cost of demolishing it.

Mr. Hemstreet explained that it would cost approximately \$504,000 to move and structurally shore the building, and if demolished, it would cost approximately \$50,000 to \$75,000. The cost savings due to a change in direction could be used to fund Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment, which were presently unfunded.

Mr. Jean-Francois LeJeune commented that he also wanted a legal opinion from the City Attorney. He added that the cost overruns were not warranted.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

JMG/RM/TH/KLM/ig F:\CAP\\\$a|\\IRENE\GO BOND\Minutes\030303.doc